

ENERGY COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES

Community Services Development Department – King Conference Room
700 North 10th Street, Sacramento, CA

February 21, 2008

Time: 10:00 am – 3:00 pm

Energy Council members present: Arleen Novotney and Kathy Kifaya from SoCal Forum, Edward O'Campo and Louise Perez from ACCESS, Val Martinez and Linda McQueen from ARNCEP, Dennis Osmer from LSPC, and Bill Parker from BAPRC.

CSD Staff present: Lloyd Throne, Renee Webster-Hawkins, Jason Wimbley, Kathy Ely, and Lynn Wiley

The following represents the agenda items discussed during the meeting:

1. Welcome and Introductions
2. Purpose of Council/Relationship between Council and CSD/Roles and Responsibilities of Council Members
3. California Solar Initiative
4. Identification and prioritization of CSD's energy program objectives and initiatives for 2008 and possibly future years

Item 1. Welcome and Introductions

Lloyd Throne called the meeting to order at 10:00 am. Welcome and introductions commenced. The meeting moved into discussion of Item 2 on the agenda.

Item 2. Purpose of Council/Relationship between Council and CSD/Roles and Responsibilities of Council Members

Lloyd Throne spoke to his vision of the Energy Council (EC) and meetings:

Serve as a working representative council to the department;
Realizing that the department has finite resources leverage the opportunity to work collaboratively with Energy Council members and the department on program and policy priorities;

Energy Council members are to represent the membership of their association organizations and thru the collective representation of the Energy

Council serve as representative body to the entire LIHEAP service provider network (service provider);

Department of Community Services and Development (CSD) will prepare meeting documents and other pertinent information in advance as to provide adequate time for advance meeting preparation of EC members; The EC service provider members are to establish a point person at the council and to use the expertise of the service providers;

The meetings will be a forum to share information as well as to focus on priority issues;

CSD is committed to being transparent as to provide EC members with a better contextual understanding on issues; and

The EC will aid in the establishment of goals, defining objectives with deliverable timeframes.

Lloyd Throne solicited feedback from EC members on what they expected to gain from EC, and what issues they think are important to begin working on for PY 2008. In general, EC members support the purpose of the EC and Lloyd's vision. The following are the specific comments offered by each meeting participant:

Jason Wimbley stated the EC will assist CSD with managing initiatives, establishing transparency in order to ensure consistency and formal understanding with final work products.

Ed O'Campo considers automation and solar to be priorities. Hopeful, that within the next six months the automation project will be clearly defined with a project road map outline and the solar project will be underway. Further suggested, EC members should bring forward issues and questions from service providers who are not members to the EC.

Arleen Novotney would like the EC to engage in discussions concerning Low Income Oversight Board (LIOB) issues and utility issues.

Louise Perez stated the EC is a good venue to dialogue about current and future issues, develop long-term strategies and approaches to build capacity of network and pursue opportunities, and a forum to weigh in on issues.

Kathy Kifaya thanked Lloyd for providing an inclusive approach to including the service providers in decision making. Kathy desires closure to the automation issues and would like a system that merges CLASS and Serv Trak to minimize duplication and reduce the programmatic support burden on agencies.

Bill Parker agreed with colleagues and expressed concern on the tenure of the EC to ensure continuity. He would like to see improvement with the regulations, resolution of the funding formula that is realistic for agencies whose funding was drastically reduced, and collaboration with the CPUC on energy issues and funding. Additionally develop better working relationships with individual utilities. Also would like to see all the programs work together CSBG/LIHEAP/DOE.

Linda McQueen agreed with the others and expressed that the members of the EC are well experienced. She reflected on the CLASS project and how this project was extremely successful because of CSD and the network's commitment to collaborate.

Dennis Osmer agreed with the others and added that the CLASS project was extremely collaborative with mutual respect. He hopes EC is as successful as demonstrated in the formation of the LIHEAP Automation Collaboration Team (LACT) and its successful work in developing the CLASS project. He would like the EC to develop a more unified front in dealing with utilities.

Renee Webster-Hawkins expressed that the EC provides the opportunity to make balanced decisions. The EC service provider members can help CSD make better decisions, and provide the leadership to the network. EC members can question CSD on any issues and obtain insider perspective.

Lloyd Throne advised that he envisions that service providers will be informed of EC progress at the quarterly LIHEAP service provider meetings. He would like to see the LIHEAP service provider meetings to be more interactive and less "talking heads" from CSD. The EC would select a service provider member as the point person for each subject who would serve as the spokesperson for that subject at the service provider meeting. He asked the group if they had another vision. EC members agreed with this vision.

Lloyd Throne indicated he wants a written document that recaps the meeting that creates movement and understanding of issues. He stated that there are service providers that elect not to actively participate at the LIHEAP Service Provider meetings for a variety of reasons. He stated that the EC has to agree to inform everyone and CSD will rely on EC to facilitate communication to the entire network. He stated that if service providers do not agree with the direction of the EC, then the EC should agree to keep moving forward so as not to disable the process. He stated that the EC offers real opportunity with a unified front. He asked the group what would be the best way to communicate between meetings.

Louise Perez stated that a point person of the EC should present subject. Renee Webster-Hawkins agreed and expressed that the point person would

be an extension of CSD working team and included automatically on all communications associated with that project.

Kathy Kifaya stated that conference calls should be held, use CSD website for posting information, each sub-committee should have its own in-box, and the entire network should have access to information. She agrees with Lloyd Throne on reducing the “talking heads” and to involve agencies that are not vocal at providers meetings.

Lloyd Throne stated he is committed to creating a viable information sharing process and advised that the EC website is already available.

Kathy Kifaya stated that CSBG funding can't touch LIHEAP programs funding and seeks better ways to integrate programs. Lloyd Throne suggested putting a panel of agencies together from CSBG/LIHEAP to figure out how to collaborate. Linda McQueen agreed and expressed her challenges in trying to collaborate with CSBG entities in her service territory since they do not have LIHEAP funding. Renee Webster-Hawkins suggested regional workshops to foster collaboration.

Renee Webster-Hawkins stated that before we move into the CSI Discussion to recap agreements made on the process of the EC committee meetings.

1. Identify subject matter point person(s)
2. Each meeting has a scribe and draft minutes. Kathy E. and Arleen will rotate being scribe and drafting minutes.
3. Minutes will be produced within five (5) business days.
4. Arleen will write key points on board.
5. Agenda will be produced at the end of each meeting for the next meeting
6. Materials will be provided in adequate time prior to the next meeting
7. The start time is flexible and does not want to limit end time since some subjects may demand more attention.

The EC group all agreed to the stated process.

Item 3 – California Solar Initiative

Jason Wimbley stated that the goal of the discussion is to elevate knowledge of the group. He stated we are currently in the research and development phase of exploring a feasible model design for implementing and exploring a statewide CSI program under CSD's administration. The overview included a review of several documents contained under Attachment 1.

Note: Please refer to this document as notes were not taken during this segment since the document was read out loud. After review of Attachment 1 the EC group had the following observations and questions.

Val Martinez asked if the subcontractor can teach the service providers to install PV systems. Jason advised that we are partnering with Sue Kateley from California Solar Energy Industries Association (CAL SEIA) who would be willing to design training.

Ed O'Campo wanted to know if he can hire someone with a C-60 license already. Jason Wimbley advised that this is allowable. Bill Parker wanted to know if there will be funding for training to obtain licensing. Jason Wimbley indicated that there is no funding available from the CSI program; however, PG&E would be willing to enter some type partnership to provide training. Val Martinez suggested setting up a centralized training and setting aside funding from DOE T&TA funding.

Bill Parker asked if workforce investments initiative is discussing solar training statewide. Jason Wimbley stated he is unsure and that CSD needs assistance from the service providers to understand what is currently being offered at the local level. Kathy Kifaya offered that we may be able to get the gas companies to pay for training.

Val Martinez asked if the post-installation inspections can be conducted by the building permit department. Jason Wimbley indicated this is something we can explore and added that we need to begin exploring the design of a data collection/management system to facilitate the data collection and sharing efforts with all involved stakeholder groups

Jason Wimbley discussed the possible partnerships that CSD has explored. Jason stated that CSD had a meeting with PG&E and they are offering assistance with training and development, storage of bulk purchases, loan payment collection (takes about 6 to 9 months to setup), and incentive programs. He stated that PG&E is unable to offer LIEE funds to support the CSI program, but will look into other funds as a possible resource for gap funding. Also, they aren't able to back loans and offer the loan collection services mentioned above.

Jason Wimbley shared with the group, details of a meeting he had with Sue Kateley, Executive Director of CAL SEIA. The organization represents the majority of California solar contractors. CAL SEIA is very much interested in formulating a partnership to support the department's administration of CSI in the areas of: solar installations, assessment training, advocacy to the state legislator and CPUC, and serving as a technical resource to the department and service provider network

Ed O'Campo indicated that Edison is in favor of partial systems to take customers to the lower tier. The EC group engaged in discussing financing options since the CSI program does not provide full subsidies. The EC group agreed this is one of the most significant challenges of this program. Jason Wimbley stated there are several options we can explore to mitigate the out-of-pocket expenses or to fully subsidize which include using DOE funding towards solar for training, subsidizing systems etc., using LIHEAP funding to install measures to immediately reduce electric base load (similar to the Cal LIHEAP program), and possibly using the leveraging incentive program to off-set costs.

Val Martinez cautioned on using leveraging since the incentive is based on providers' proportionate share. Jason Wimbley stated that the leveraging could be used as the option of the provider participating in CSI to off-set costs for the solar installation.

Renee Webster-Hawkins indicated that this is a key decision that the EC needs to make. She questioned the EC members; "Do we put up some of our resources to subsidize the program?" Val Martinez asked, "How much funding are we looking at?" Renee Webster-Hawkins advised about 4 to 5 million.

The EC agreed that we should discuss further as we move into Item 4 on the agenda. Before moving into Item 4, the EC agreed to change the meeting dates to the 2nd Thursday of each month. The next meeting is scheduled for March 13 to commence at 10:00 am.

Item 4 – Identification and prioritization of CSD's energy program objectives and initiatives for 2008 and possibly future years

The EC members engaged in a prioritization session where PY 2008 work objectives were determined. Minutes were not captured during this segment since the outcome of the prioritization is captured in Attachment 2. Please refer to these documents for the listing of work priorities identified for PY 2008.

Val Martinez made a motion to move that an ad hoc committee is formed to make a recommendation to the EC on March 13 whether or not it is feasible for CSD to pursue the administrator over the CSI program. The ad hoc committee will focus solely on strategies for financing or strategies to mitigate out-of-pocket expenses. The group moved the motion.